# **OPINION 2372** (Case 3605)

PHYCINAE Lyneborg, 1976 (Insecta, Diptera, THEREVIDAE): spelling emended to PHYCUSINAE and *Phycis* Walbaum, 1792 (Osteichthyes, Gadiformes, PHYCIDAE): usage conserved by designation of *Blennius phycis* Linnaeus, 1766 as the type species

Abstract. The Commission has removed homonymy between the family-group names PHYCINAE Swainson, 1838 (Osteichthyes, Gadiformes, PHYCIDAE) and PHYCINAE Lyneborg, 1976 (Insecta, Diptera, THEREVIDAE) by emending the stem of the genusgroup name *Phycus* Walker, 1850, on which the insect family-group name is based, and has changed the family-group name to PHYCUSINAE, leaving the fish family-group name, based on *Phycis* Walbaum, 1792, unaltered. The prevailing usage of *Phycis* Walbaum, 1792 has been conserved by setting aside all previous type species fixations and designating *Blennius phycis* Linnaeus, 1766 as the type species.

**Keywords.** Nomenclature; taxonomy; Insecta; Osteichthyes; Diptera; Gadiformes; Lepidoptera; Phycidae; Phy

### Ruling

- (1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that:
  - (a) for the purposes of Article 29 of the Code the stem of the generic name *Phycus* Walker, 1850, is *Phycus*-;
  - (b) all previous type species fixations for the generic name *Phycis* Walbaum, 1792 are hereby set aside and *Blennius phycis* Linnaeus, 1766 is designated as the type species.
- (2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
  - (a) *Phycus* Walker, 1850 (gender: masculine), type species *Xylophagus canescens* Walker, 1848, by monotypy (Insecta, Diptera);
  - (b) *Phycis* Walbaum, 1792 (gender: feminine), type species *Blennius phycis* Linnaeus, 1766 (Osteichthyes, Gadiformes), as ruled in (1) above.
- (3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
  - (a) canescens Walker, 1848, as published in the binomen *Xylophagus canescens* (specific name of the type species of *Phycus* Walker, 1850) (Insecta, Diptera);
  - (b) *phycis* Linnaeus, 1766, as published in the binomen *Blennius phycis* (specific name of the type species of *Phycis* Walbaum, 1792) (Osteichthyes, Gadiformes), as ruled in (1) above.
- (4) The name PHYCUSINAE Lyneborg, 1976, type genus *Phycus* Walker, 1850 (spelling emended by the ruling in (1) above) (Insecta, Diptera) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology.

(5) The name PHYCINAE Lyneborg, 1976 (an incorrect original spelling of PHYCUSINAE, as ruled in (1) above) (Insecta, Diptera) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology.

### **History of Case 3605**

An application to remove homonymy between the family-group names PHYCINAE Swainson, 1838 (Osteichthyes, Gadiformes, PHYCIDAE) and PHYCINAE Lyneborg, 1976 (Insecta, Diptera, THEREVIDAE) and to designate *Blennius phycis* Linnaeus, 1766 as the type species of *Phycis* Walbaum, 1792 was received from Stephen D. Gaimari & Martin Hauser (*California Department of Food and Agriculture, Plant Pest Diagnostics Center, Sacramento, CA, U.S.A.*) and Ronald Fricke (*Staatliches Museum für Naturkunde Stuttgart, Ichthyology, Stuttgart, Germany*) on 23 August 2012. After correspondence the Case was published in BZN 70: 22–29 (March 2013). The title, abstract and keywords of the Case were published on the Commission's website. Comments on this Case were published in BZN 70(2): 113 (with alternative proposals); 70(4): 252–253 (author's response and rejection of the alternative proposals). The two sets of proposals were sent for vote on 1 March 2015. A greater than two-thirds majority of Commissioners voted FOR set A (21 For, 2 Against, 1 Split). A majority of Commissioners voted AGAINST set B (2 For, 20 Against, 1 Split).

#### **Decision of the Commission**

At the close of the voting period on 1 June 2015 the votes were as follows:

## Set A (original proposals):

Affirmative votes – 21: Ballerio, Bogutskaya, Brothers, Fautin, Halliday, Harvey, Kojima, Kottelat, Krell, Kullander, Lamas, Ng, Pape, Patterson, Rosenberg, Štys, van Tol, Winston, Yanega, Zhang and Zhou.

Negative votes – 2: Alonso-Zarazaga, Bouchet.

Split – 1: Grygier (FOR all except AGAINST (3)(a))

Pyle was on leave of absence.

# Set B (alternative proposals):

Affirmative votes – 2 Alonso-Zarazaga, Bouchet.

Negative votes – 20: Ballerio, Bogutskaya, Brothers, Fautin, Halliday, Harvey, Kojima, Kottelat, Krell, Kullander, Lamas, Ng, Pape, Patterson, Rosenberg, Štys, van Tol, Winston, Yanega and Zhang.

Split – 1: Grygier FOR (1)(b), (2)(b), (3)(b); AGAINST all others.

Abstained: – 1: Zhou

Pyle was on leave of absence.

Voting FOR set A, Kojima said that he preferred the proposal that tried to ensure the stability of the name(s) to those that tried to keep their Latin/Greek grammatical consistency. Also voting FOR set A, Kottelat said that he voted for the whole set A in order to close the case, although Proposal (1)(b) was either not needed or

incomplete. He explained that the application had stated that the original type species of Phycis was Gadus bifurcus by monotypy and that its type series included material of two species, Phycis phycis and Phycis blennoides. The application further stated that 'Günther (1862) acted as the First Reviser . . . treating Gadus bifurcus . . . as a junior subjective synonym of Phycis blennoides'. Listing Gadus bifurcus as synonym of one or the other species was not a First Reviser action and did not fix the identity of the nominal species, which could only be fixed by a neotype designation. In addition, the application did not mention that Blennius phycis (currently Phycis phycis) was based on several pre-Linnean literature sources and its type series could also include more than one species. No syntypes of B. phycis were believed to be in existence, warranting a type fixation. Designation of the same specimen as neotype for both Gadus bifurcus and Blennius phycis would close the Case. Further, the argument that 'in the future the two species may be classified in separate genera, was misleading, as the case could be re-visited if and when it actually happened. Also Voting FOR set A, Kullander commented that whereas he sympathised with Option B presented by Alonso-Zarazaga, and using PHYCIDIDAE/PHYCIDINAE would make the name easier to remember, current usage favoured PHYCINAE.

Voting AGAINST set A and FOR set B, Bouchet said that the applicants were mistaken to believe that, in the event the family name based on *Phycis* be ruled to be PHYCIDIDAE, the Commission would need to use its plenary power to suspend application of the Principle of Priority for Swainson's (1838) family-group name. He added that Miguel Alonso-Zarazaga's proposals (set B) elegantly solved the issue raised in the original application.

SPLITTING his vote, Grygier said that in either set of proposals, he saw no justification under Article 78.4.2 for placing *Xylophagus canescens* on the Official List, since it is not the object of any specific ruling under the plenary or specific powers. As for which stem to emend, he accepted that Articles 29.3.1.1 and 29.5 were introduced into the Fourth Edition of the Code largely to accommodate the continued use by ichthyologists of elided stems of genera ending in -is, and that maintenance of PHYCIDAE as the valid name for the fish family was by no means improper in the absence of objections from dipterists.

## **Original references**

The following are the original references to the names placed on either an Official List or Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

canescens, Xylophagus, Walker, 1848, List of the specimens of dipterous insects in the collection of the British Museum, vol. 1. British Museum, London, p. 129.

phycis, Blennius, Linnaeus, 1766, Systema Naturae, Ed. 12, vol. 1, part 1, Salvii, Holmiae, p. 422. Phycis Walbaum, 1792, Petri Artedi sueci Genera Piscium in quibus systema totum Ichthyologiae proponitur cum classibus, ordinibus, generum characteribus, specierum differentiis, observationibus plurimis: redactis Speciebus 242 ad Genera 52. Ichthyologiae pars 3. Ant. Ferdin. Röse, Grypeswaldiae, p. 575.

Phycus Walker, 1850, Diptera, vol. 1, in Saunders, W.W. (Ed.), Insecta Saundersiana: or characters of undescribed insects in the collection of William Wilson Saunders, John Van Voorst, London, p. 2.

PHYCUSINAE Lyneborg, 1976, Bulletin of the British Museum, Entomology, 33(3): 197 (spelling emended from PHYCINAE).

PHYCINAE Lyneborg, 1976, Bulletin of the British Museum, Entomology, 33(3): 197 (ruled to be an incorrect original spelling of PHYCUSINAE).